TOLER SCHAFFER, LLP

5000 Plaza on the Lake, Suite 265 Austin, TX 78746 Ph. 512-327-5515 Fax 512-327-5575

RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER** MAY 0 2 2006

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

DATE: May 2, 2006

TO: Examiner PATEL, Hemant FAX NO.:

571-273-8300

Shantilal

USPTO GPAU 2645

FROM: Jeffrey G. Toler

Reg. No.: 38,342

RE U.S. App. No.: 10/644,260, filed August 20, 2003

Applicant(s): John Patrick Romeo

Atty Dkt No.: 1033-SS00413

Title: A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MULTI-MODAL MONITORING

OF A NETWORK

NO. OF PAGES (including Cover Sheet): 10

MESSAGE:

Attached please find:

☐ Transmittal Form (1 pg)

Notice of Appeal (in duplicate) (2 pgs)

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (1 pg)

Remarks in Support of the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (5 pgs)

5000 Plaza On The Lake Suite 265 AUSTIN, TEXAS 78746

Tel: (512) 327-5515 Fax: (512) 327-5575

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The pages accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law office of Toler Schaffer, L.L.P. and are confidential and privileged. The information is intended to be used by the individual(s) or entity(les) named on this cover sheet only. If you are not the intended recipient be aware that reading disclosing copying distribution or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. Please notify us immediately if you have received this transmission in error at the number listed above and return the document to us via regular mail.

Signature

Date

Printed name

[AZ -

5-1-2006

Jeffrey G. Toler

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 273

MAY 0 2 2006

PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to Application Number 10/644,260 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL August 20, 2003 First Named Inventor FORM John Patrick Romeo Art Unit 2645 Examiner Name PATEL, Hemant Shantilal (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 1033-SS00413 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify ~ Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request below): Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review; Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request Remarks in Support of the Pre-Appeal CD, Number of CD(s)_ Information Disclosure Statement Brief Request for Review Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application CUSTOMER NO.: 60533 Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Toler Schaffer, L.L.P.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature Esther H. Yu Date Typed or printed name May 2, 2000

Reg. No.

38,342

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS, SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 273

MAY 0 2 2006

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REO

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)
Approved for use through xx/xx/200x, QMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Docket Number (Optional) PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW 1033-SS00413 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the Application Number Filed United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mall in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for 10/644,260 August 20, 2003 Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] May 2, 2006 First Named Inventor John Patrick Romeo Art Unit Examiner Typed or printed Esther H. Yu 2645 PATEL, Hemant S. Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided. I am the applicant/inventor. Signature assignee of record of the entire interest. Jeffrey G. Toler See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTQ/SB/96) Typed or printed name attomey or agent of record. 38,342 512-327-5515 Registration number_ Telephone number attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. 5-1-2006 Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required, Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below. 1 "Total of forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete. Indicuting gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form end/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 0 2 2006

NO. 273

CUSTOMER NO. 60533

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

John Patrick Romeo

Title:

A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MULTI-MODAL MONITORING

OF A NETWORK

App. No.:

10/644,260

Filed:

August 20, 2003

Examiner:

PATEL, Hemant Shantilal

Group Art Unit:

2645

Atty. Dkt. No.: 1033-SS00413

Confirmation No.:

7476

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents P.Q. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF THE PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on February 10, 2006 (hereinafter, "the Final Office Action"), Applicant hereby cancels claim 20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the rejection of claim 20 over Saleh is rendered moot. Pursuant to the Notice of Appeal and Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review submitted herewith, the Applicant requests review of the following issues:

1. Claims 1-8 Are Allowable over Gerber and Becket

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0025806 A1 ("Gerber") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,220 B1 ("Beckett"), at pages 8-11, paragraph 4 of the Final Office Action.

The Final Office Action asserts that Beckett teaches "format conversion to audible sound" at Figure 1, item 50, and col. 17, lines 30-34. See Final Office Action, p. 9, paragraph 4. However, Beckett discloses voice hardware for synchronized voice and screen monitoring from a remote location for providing training assistance to an employee that uses a workstation in connection with a telephone. See Beckett, Abstract. Beckett discloses that it is desirable to allow a supervisor of an agent to "look over the shoulder" of the agent during the agent's telephone

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAJLING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents on _________. Esther H. Yu

Typed or Printed Name

Signature

NO. 273

conversations to view the agent's computer activities while listening to the agent's telephone conversations. See Beckett, col. 1, line 59-col. 2, line 12. Beckett discloses a method and apparatus for providing on-the-job work training of an agent including passive workstation monitoring that allows a supervisor to "simultaneously monitor" on-screen and telephonic activities of the agent. See Beckett, col. 2, lines 30-40. Voice hardware 50 is provided "in the form of a voice card mounted within the server" and wired to the telephone system to provide telephone extensions to the supervisor and the agent. See Beckett, col. 17, lines 30-35.

The Final Office Action acknowledges that Gerber fails to disclose or suggest "format conversion to audible sound." See Final Office Action, p. 9, paragraph 4. Beckett fails to disclose or suggest a format converter associated with the multimodal administration engine, the format converter operable to translate at least a portion of a first signal representing network information into a second signal representing an audible sound, as recited by claim 1. The voice hardware of Beckett simply routes the telephone conversation to the supervisor. See Beckett, Abstract, and col. 17, lines 30-35. Beckett makes no mention of format conversion to audible sound. Moreover, Becket routes telephone conversations (See Beckett, col. 2, lines 30-40). Beckett fails to disclose or suggest translating at least a portion of a first signal representing network information into a second signal representing audible sound, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, since the Final Office Action acknowledges that Gerber fails to disclose this element, and since Beckett fails to disclose this feature in view of the discussion above, the asserted combination of Gerber and Beckett fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of independent claim 1, and of claims 2-8, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-8 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as discussed at pages 8-10 of the reply to non-final office action, sent December 17, 2005, Gerber and Beckett fail to disclose or suggest a motivation to make the asserted combination and the asserted combination constitutes an impermissible hindsight reconstruction based on the disclosure of the present application. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

2. Claims 9 and 10 are Allowable over Gerber and Beckett, in View of Metcalf

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gerber and Beckett, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0122541 A1 ("Metcalf") at pages 11-12 of the Final Office Action.

While the web assistant feature of Metcalf translates a user voice command into "a signal that mimics signals from other input devices (e.g., a mouse or keyboard) for performing the same function" (See Metcalf, p. 6, paragraph 59), Metcalf fails to overcome the deficiencies of Gerber and Beckett with respect to claim 1. Namely, Metcalf fails to disclose or suggest translating at least a portion of a first signal representing network information into a second signal representing audible sound, as recited in claim 1. Thus, the asserted combination of Gerber, Beckett and Metcalf fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the dependent claims 9 and 10, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 9 and 10 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, the Final Office Action acknowledges that Gerber and Beckett fail to disclose or suggest a format converter operable to translate at least a second portion of a first signal representing network information into a third signal receivable by the access device type, translating at least a second portion of a first signal representing network information into a third signal receivable by the access device type, as recited by claim 9. Instead, Metcalf discloses converting an audible command into a user command signal. See Metcalf, p. 6, paragraph 59. Metcalf fails to disclose or suggest that the user command is "a first signal representing network information" as recited by claim 9. Therefore, the asserted combination fails to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 9.

Additionally, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a motivation to make the asserted combination. It would not have been obvious to a worker skilled in the art to modify a network management server of Gerber with an agent on-screen and telephone monitoring system of Beckett and with an automated reception system of Metcalf to make the alleged combination. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Gerber, Beckett and Metcalf is an impermissible hindsight reconstruction based on the disclosure of the present application. The rejection over the asserted combination should be withdrawn.

3. Claim 11-17 and 19 Are Allowable Over the Asserted Combination of Gerber, Saleh, and Metcalf

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 11-14, 16, and at 17 under §103(a) over Gerber in view of Saleh, and further in view of Metcalf at pages 13-17, paragraph 6 of the Final Office Action. The Final Office Action acknowledges that Gerber and Saleh fail to disclose or suggest that a party can receive graphical information via a data connection. The Final Office

Action asserts that Metcalf discloses this feature at paragraphs 56 and 59. See Final Office Action, p. 14, paragraph 6.

Metcalf at paragraph 56 discloses a network server to provide a subscriber or a supervisor with system or user configuration information, which may be displayed on a computer connected to the network. However, Metcalf discloses that the network server is configured to send messages over the network, such as the world wide web, via a Web interface. See Metcalf, paragraph 55. The supervisor or user accesses the web interface of the server to receive graphical information (See Metcalf, paragraphs 55 and 56) and the user accesses a telephone interface for audio interaction (See Metcalf, paragraphs 58 and 59). Metcalf fails to disclose or suggest recognizing that a party can receive audible information via the call and graphical information via a data connection, as recited by claim 11. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Gerber, Saleh and Metcalf fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of independent claim 11, and of claims 12-14, 16 and 17, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 11.

4. Claim 18 is Allowable over Gerber, Saleh, and Metcalf, and further in View of McDuff

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 18 under §103(a) over Gerber, Saleh, and Metcalf, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,350 B2 ("McDuff") at pages 17-18, paragraph 7 of the Final Office Action. The Final Office Action acknowledges that the asserted combination of Gerber, Saleh, and Metcalf fails to disclose or suggest initiating communication to the party of information representing a graphical user interface that displays a visual representation of a network monitored by the network management engine, as recited in claim 18. McDuff discloses that the server outputs events that are packaged in event structures, which are processed and categorized and sent over a data link to the monitoring system client. See McDuff, col. 5, lines 12-16. This type of information may be a change of state information (See McDuff, col. 5, lines 30-37 and lines 49-52) or statistical information (See McDuff, col. 5, lines 55-56. However, McDuff discloses that the statistical information is "not continuously fed into the monitoring system client 51; rather, the monitoring system client 51 polls CTIMS 36 on a periodic basis (such as every 5 seconds) by sending requests 54 to receive updated statistics 56 from CTIMS." See McDuff, col. 5, lines 55-64. Thus, the system of McDuff fails to "initiate communication to the party of information representing a graphical user interface that displays a visual representation of a network monitored by the network management engine" as recited in

CUSTOMER NO. 60533

claim 18. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Gerber, Saleh, Metcalf and McDuff fails to disclose or suggest initiating communication to the party of information representing a graphical user interface that displays a visual representation of a network monitored by the network management engine, as recited by claim 18. Moreover, McDuff fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Gerber, Saleh and Metcalf applied to claim 11, as discussed above. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Gerber, Saleh, Metcalf and McDuff fails to disclose or suggest at least two elements of claim 18. Therefore, the rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Final Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of allowability of each of the claims now pending.

Applicant does not believe that any additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

5-1-2006 Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342 Attorney for Applicant(s) TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P. 5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265 Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 327-5515 (phone) (512) 327-5575 (fax)

JGT/RMR